



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/000,289 | 11/02/2001 | Uday C. Sagi | 29505/PF02186NA | 9027 |

29978 7590 03/23/2004

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN (MOTOROLA)
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 6300
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6402

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUC M

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2685

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/000,289

Applicant(s)

SAGI ET AL.

Examiner

Duc M. Nguyen

Art Unit

2685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-15,17-30 and 32-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-15,17-30 and 32-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's response filed on 2/23/04. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17-30, 32-34 are now pending in the present application.

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 2/23/04 introduces a file type indicator into the disclosure. However, since this indicator is considered as an inherent feature of an attachment file, it would be entered and treated as an inherent feature for a message comprising an attachment file or has more than one file format.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims **1, 3-10, 12-15, 17-30, 32-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Lazaridis et al** (US Pat No. **6,463,464**) in view of **Ogle** (US Pat. Number **6,430,604**).

Regarding claim **1**, **Lazaridis** discloses a method for redirecting (routing) an E-mail message comprising a plurality of file attachments based on the user's preferences

Art Unit: 2685

(profile), wherein each of the attachment file type is delivered to different devices according to user's preferences specified in the redirector program (see **col. 6, lines 14-55**), this would include all the claimed limitations, noting that the file type indicator is the inherent feature of the file attachment in order for a receiver to be able to receive, identify and decode the attachment file according the specified file type indicator (i.e, image.GIF or image.JPEG).

Although Lazaridis discloses the communication messages comprise electronics messages, Lazaridis is silence on real-time communication (instant) messages. However, in an analogous art, **Ogle** discloses a system for enabling message system to deliver instant messages to a subscriber based on the subscriber profile (see **Abstract, Figs. 5F1, 5F2, 5G**). Since the teaching of Lazaridis would obviously be applicable to redirecting instant messages and would work equally well, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to incorporate the above teaching of Lazaridis to the instant messaging system in Ogle for providing a method as claimed, for utilizing advantages of real-time (instant) message such as quick response.

Regarding claim **14**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since in another embodiment, Godfrey discloses the redirector program is implemented at the network server (see Fig. 2 and col. 9, lines 27-57), and further discloses a gateway and servers (see Fig. 2), it would have been obvious to one skill in the art for providing a system as claimed, for allowing a single system administrator to configure and keep track of all users having messages redirected.

Regarding claim **23**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since **Ogle** discloses a computer-readable medium (see col. 6, lines 1-65 and columns 15-16), it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to modify Lazaridis and Ogley for providing subroutines as claimed, for organizing software programs so that they can be easily managed when making changes or modifications.

Regarding claims **15, 24**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 14, 23 above. In addition, Lazaridis as modified would disclose one of text, voice messages as claimed (see Ogle, col. 9, lines 43-59).

Regarding claims **3, 17, 25**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 14, 23 above. In addition, Lazaridis discloses operating information (type and capabilities) of one of devices as claimed (see col. 9, lines 46-47, col. 10, lines 53-54).

Regarding claims **4, 18, 26**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 14, 23 above. In addition, Lazaridis discloses one of information (type and capabilities) of the mobile devices as claimed (see col. 10, lines 53-54).

Regarding claims **5-6, 19, 27-28**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 14, 23 above. In addition, Lazaridis discloses one of operating format (type and capabilities) or preference format as claimed (see col. 10, lines 53-54).

Regarding claims **7, 29**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1, 14, 23 above. In addition, since **Ogle** discloses format conversions for the message (see Fig. 5F2, ref. 730 and col. 9, lines 43-59), it would have been obvious to

one skill in the art to modify Lazaridis and Ogley for converting file format of a components as claimed, so that the user would be able to receive the message with important attachments in a format compatible with the mobile device's capabilities.

Regarding claims **8, 30**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 14, 23 above. In addition, since Lazaridis discloses the user of the mobile device could transmit any number of other command to control the operation of the redirector program (see col. 10, lines 14-16, col. 13, lines 27-30), it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to modify Lazaridis and Ogley for converting file format of a message component based on the user input as claimed, so that the user would be able to receive the message with important attachments in a format compatible with capabilities of a device available to the user at the time (i.e, the user got a new device or rent a device while on travel).

Regarding claim **9**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since **Ogle** discloses a text-to-speech format conversion (see Fig. 5F2, ref. 730 and col. 9, lines 43-59), it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to further incorporate a text-to-speech format conversion to, so that the user would be able to receive the important message in a format compatible with capabilities of a device available to the user at the time (i.e, a regular phone)

Regarding claim **10**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since such GIF and WBMP formats are known in the art (Official Notice), it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to modify Lazaridis and Ogley for using format as claimed, for cost saving.

Regarding claims **12, 32**, the claims are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 14, 23 above.

Regarding claims **13, 22, 33**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 14, 23 above. In addition, **Ogle** discloses an instant message as claimed.

Regarding claims **20-21**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Ogle** discloses protocols as claimed (see Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 44-67).

Regarding claim **34**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 23 above. In addition, **Ogle** discloses the medium comprises one of components as claimed (see Fig. 2).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 14, 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Malkin et al (US 6,643,684), Sender-specified delivery customization.
- Li et al (US 6,345,279), Method and apparatus for adapting multimedia content for client devices.

Art Unit: 2685

- Beyda et al (US 6,505,237), Method and system for management of message attachments.
- Godfrey et al (US 6,463,463), System and method for pushing calendar event messages from a host system to a mobile data communication device.

4. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-4531, Monday-Thursday (9:00 AM - 5:00 PM). Or to Edward Urban (Supervisor) whose telephone number is (703) 305-4385.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Duc M. Nguyen



Mar 18, 2004